



Patent
Attorney's Docket No. 004968-005

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of)
David R. FERGUSON et al.) Group Art Unit: 2771
Application No.: 08/947,435) Examiner: E. Colbert
Filed: October 8, 1997)
For: COMPUTER-BASED DOCUMENT)
MANAGEMENT SYSTEM)

RECEIVED
SEP 11 2000
TC 2700 MAIL ROOM

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

The Applicants would like to thank Examiner Colbert and Primary Examiner Alam for the courtesy of the personal interview on Wednesday, August 30, 2000. The Applicants respectfully submit that the following is an accurate summary of the interview and respectfully request its entry into the file record.

At the onset of the interview, Applicants' representatives addressed several issues with respect to formalities of the outstanding Office Action. Specifically, Applicants' representatives asked for clarification regarding the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as well as clarification as to the whether claims 1, 2 and 51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 or 35 U.S.C. 103. In response to which, Examiners Colbert and Alam indicated that claims 1, 2 and 51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 and that it was the "breath" of claims 1, 32, 33, 39, 51 and 53-58 which prompted the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Therein a brief summary of the invention was provided and the discussion focused

on claim 1. Specifically, the failure of Zarmer to disclose the steps of automatically extracting attribute data from the imported document, generating a data structure for the document, wherein said data structure contains the attribute data in a second format independent of said first format, and wherein said data structure is stored and maintained in memory separate from the imported document, and linking the imported document to a first electronic folder if the attribute data contained in said data structure matches a set of predefined criteria corresponding to the first electronic folder. Examiners Colbert and Alam, agreed that it appeared that the cited passages of Zarmer failed to disclose the steps of claim 1 identified above. However, Examiner Alam indicated that a more thorough review of the Zarmer patent as well as discussion with Primary Examiner Amsbury would be required prior to any decision regarding the withdrawal of the rejection in view of Zarmer.

If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this interview summary, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

By: Penny L. Caudle
Penny L. Caudle
Registration No. P-46,607

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620

Date: September 7, 2000